



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,766	04/13/2004	Randy L. Rummel	DYCOOK.015C1	6739
20995	7590	12/12/2006	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP				BASICHAS, ALFRED
2040 MAIN STREET				ART UNIT
FOURTEENTH FLOOR				PAPER NUMBER
IRVINE, CA 92614				3749

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

NT

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/824,766	RUMMEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alfred Basichas	3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 26-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 26-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 26-32 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-49 of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,965. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. **Applicants have amended the claims to include the limitation “at least a portion of a wall separating the combustion box from the oven cavity not being insulated. There is no mention of insulation in the specification of the instant invention. It appears that applicants have noted that the prior art discloses structure not present in the instant application and have attempted to overcome the rejection under anticipation by adding language not present in the instant application as filed. Accordingly, this appears to be an afterthought and has not been considered for failing to comply with the written description requirement set forth in the MPEP.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 26-32, as understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gilliom (4,108,139), which shows all of the claimed limitations, including among other things,

26. An oven 10 comprising: an oven cavity 17; a fan compartment 50 adjacent a wall 20 of the oven cavity and housing a fan 51 therein; a combustion box 35 located below the fan compartment; a tube-type gas burner 32 located adjacent and parallel (see at least fig. 3) to a front wall 31 of the combustion box, the front wall of the combustion box being proximate a front 21 of the oven cavity; a flue spout 39 configured to provide fluid communication between the combustion box and an inlet portion of the fan compartment (see at least fig. 2).
27. The oven of Claim 26, wherein a portion 41,57 of the inlet portion is open to the oven cavity.
28. The oven of Claim 26, further comprising openings 58 formed in a bottom wall of the oven separating the oven cavity from the combustion box (see at least fig. 1).
29. The oven of Claim 26, wherein a bottom wall of the combustion box comprises a rearward upward slope 37 (see at least fig. 2).
30. The oven of Claim 26, wherein the combustion box comprises a plurality of air inlet holes 58.
31. The oven of Claim 26, wherein the flue spout covers substantially the entire inlet portion of the fan compartment (see at least fig. 2).
32. The oven of Claim 26, wherein the flue spout covers at least half of the inlet portion of the fan compartment (see at least fig. 2).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claim amendment have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection (see above).

- a. Nevertheless, it should be noted that there is absolutely no mention of insulation in the instant application or the lack thereof. While there is mention in the instant application of bake mode as apposed to convection mode, it should be noted that the prior art relied upon is capable of said function. In addition, it should be noted that the purpose of the insulation is not to keep the heat of the burner out of the oven cavity, but to protect the housing and environment from high temperature heat produced during the self cleaning mode (see at least Detailed Description, 1st paragraph).
- b. As regards applicants' assertion that the limitations recited in claims 28-30 are not shown by the prior art relied upon, applicants' attention is directed to the rejection above. The rejection specifically addresses the limitation of these claims. Applicants have failed to substantiate the allegation and have merely restated what the claims recite without any supporting arguments.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 571 272 4871. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center telephone number is 571 272 3700.

December 6, 2006



Alfred Basichas
Primary Examiner